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ABSTRACT

Since the declaration of Education for All (EFA) in Jomtien (Thailand) in 1990, quality education has been high in the agenda of the international community. This has created the need to improve the quality of education in many developed and developing countries. In response to international commitments to EFA goals, the Government of the Republic of Kenya is committed to improving the quality of education in secondary schools. For example, the Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI) on its part is strengthening capacities of education managers through in-service training to improve school governance for increased productivity. In spite of the Headteachers executing teacher supervisory role in their schools, and in addition to the schools having well qualified pupils from primary schools, adequate teaching/learning resources and supportive parents and stakeholders, academic performance of the public secondary schools in some selected secondary schools have been below average. This study therefore sought to establish factors influencing the choice of teacher supervisory approaches employed by headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. The objectives of the study will be to: determine the prevailing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District; establish Headteachers’ characteristics influencing the choice of supervisory approach; establish in-school factors influencing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools; and establish measures that can be put in place to improve teacher supervision in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. The findings of the study may help the head teachers to evaluate their supervisory practices and make the necessary modifications so as to enhance education outcomes. The findings may also provide the Ministry of Education with information on the status of teacher supervision in public secondary schools and hence stimulate necessary adjustments in supervisory programmes to improve the quality of education. The study will be guided by McGregor’s (1960) Theory. The study used descriptive survey design targeting all the 33 headteachers and teachers in all the public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. Stratified sampling was used to select 15 schools; each strata representing provincial and district schools. Purposive sampling was used to select 15 headteachers from the sampled schools. A questionnaire designed for the headteachers and another one for teachers were used as the main tools for data collection. Prior to the actual data collection procedure, a pilot study was carried out to pre-test the data collection procedure. The researcher sought the assistance of research experts, experienced graduates, lecturers and experienced supervisors in order to help improve validity of the instrument. Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha technique was used for measuring reliability. The study revealed that majority (73.3%) of the teachers rated headteachers supervisory practices as bureaucratic whereas headteachers (93.3%) rated themselves as both bureaucratic and professional. Regarding professional qualifications, it emerged that the choice of teachers’ supervisory approaches among headteachers did
not differ across their professional qualifications at $p<0.05$. Specifically, the study established that 54.5% of headteachers with Bachelor’s qualifications and 50.0% of headteachers with Master’s qualifications used a combination of professional and bureaucratic supervision. The study established that choice of teacher supervisory approaches statistically differed across school sponsorship at $p<0.05$, whereby headteachers from Government sponsored schools tended to use bureaucratic approach more while those from church-sponsored schools used combined approaches. The study recommends that: school management bodies should hold discussion with the teachers on curriculum delivery and supervision; the government through Ministry of Education should encourage professional development by providing funding which would help teachers in attending in-service courses; Headteachers should hold regular meeting with teachers to enhance trust and create conducive environment for mutual learning; among other recommendations.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Since the declaration of Education for All (EFA) in Jomtien (Thailand) in 1990, quality education has been high in the agenda of the international community (UNESCO, 2004). This has created the need to improve the quality of education in many developed and developing countries (UNESCO, 2007). The Dakar Framework for Action (2000) recognizes quality as a prime condition for achieving Education For All. It also advocates for the improvement and ensuring excellence of all aspects of quality of education in its sixth goal (UNESCO, 2004). Supervision is part and an important one for that matter of a general monitoring system in the education system that seeks to ensure quality in the Education sector as a whole (UNESCO, 2007).

In response to international commitments to EFA goals, the Government of the Republic of Kenya is committed to improving the quality of education in secondary schools. Teachers being an integral part of the learning process have received their due consideration. The Teachers Service Commission (TSC) is reviewing staffing norms in order to ensure equitable distribution of teachers and thus improve on their utilization. The Government through Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) is also providing in-service education for teachers in various subjects particularly Mathematics and Sciences to enhance subject mastery among teachers. The Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI) on its part is strengthening capacities of education managers through in-service training to improve school governance for increased productivity (Republic of Kenya, 2005). Although these efforts taken by the government are necessary, they will not bear the
desired results unless Headteachers who comprises of teachers most immediate supervisor are productively involved in teacher supervision. Their support and guidance to teachers as well as evaluation and follow up are critical if teachers’ quality has to improve.

According to (Eshiwani 1983, UNESCO 2005), teacher quality is of prime importance in the achievement quality education. Qualified teachers are better able to create conducive environment for learning as well as deliver the curriculum content effectively in class. Rivers and Sanders (1996) viewing quality of education from students’ achievement perspective have concluded that a teacher’s influence is the single most important factor in determining students achievements. Research has also demonstrated that knowledgeable and skillful teacher in-front of a class makes the most difference in improving students’ achievements (National Commission on teaching and America’s future (2004).

The Department of Quality Assurance and Standards is primarily responsible for improvement of teacher quality on behalf of the Ministry of Education (Wanzare 2005). However, due to many professional and administrative challenges facing the department emphasis on teacher supervision is increasingly being shifted towards the headteachers. The Presidential Working Party on Manpower Development in the next decade and beyond recommended emphasis in teacher supervision at the school level by the Headteacher stating thus: ‘the working Party underscores the fact that the most important supervision and guidance in any school is that given by the head of the school’ further on it stated ‘the working party sees the need to strengthen the role of the head of the school as “first inspectors” of their own schools hence the need to give them appropriate in-
service training.’ (ROK 1988). The Kenya Education Commission on Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training (TIQET) underscored the same issue by recommending the utilization of Headteachers and senior teachers in inspection and guidance of other teachers with the view of supplementing the work of Quality assurance Officers, (R.o.K. 1999).


> The organization and control of staff both teaching and non teaching are all part of the head’s duties as the immediate inspector of the school. In particular, he must check the teaching standard by reference to schemes of work, lesson notes, records of work done and pupils exercise books, also by actual visits to the class to see the work of individual teachers. He/she must see that he is immediately informed of all staff absences.

The Government has therefore legally mandated the Headteachers to be teacher supervisors in their schools. However, the Headteacher is perceived to be a person ‘wearing two hats’ both as an overseer and a helper at the same time which complicates his/her role performance. Part of his/her bureaucratic mandate is to make things happen and have them done in the school. This involves scheduling and assigning of work, coordinating and overseeing performance and also making sure that work is done efficiently, timely and economically (Opiyo, 2004). On the other hand, the Headteacher
as a leader of professionals has the supervisory responsibility of assisting, guiding, advising and empowering teachers in the instructional process (Akpa, 1992). Headteachers are therefore duty bound to support and empower their teachers through provision of necessary resources, opportunities to grow and provision of feedback (Akpa 1991). Confronted by this dual mandate, the Headteacher inevitably makes a choice on which supervisory approach to emphasize on to bring about the desired school goals. Sergiovanni (1995) however, has suggested the 80/20 rule which states that supervisors should spend no more than 20% of their time on administrative supervision leaving 80% of their time on professional development and improvement of their teachers.

According to Akpa and Abama, (1991) and Piraino, (2006) bureaucratic approach in supervision is based on the assumption that teachers are incompetent and lazy hence the need to inspect and closely monitor and evaluate their work through knowledgeable supervisors using fixed standards. Bureaucratic approach therefore is judgmental, hierarchical and summative in evaluation Papleniski, (2009). Pointing to the ills of this approach, Sergiovani, (1992) argues that it ends up demotivating and narrowing teachers’ participation hence retarding professional growth. Concurring with him, Piraino (2006) argues that it discourages teacher collaboration, professional enquiry and even employment of new methods that can improve instruction by teachers. Ultimately this adversely affects students academic performance since effective teaching contributes about seventy five per cent in student’s academic performance, Nansongo and Lydiah (2007).
Professionalism on the other hand is the basis of modern supervision. It is based on the following assumptions: supervision exists primarily for the improvement of the instructional programme in the school; teachers are professionals capable of doing their best given a supportive environment; Close cooperation between teachers and the supervisor releases teachers potential for the benefit of the learners and that as teachers grow professionally and improve their skills the impact is seen on the learners (Kamindo, 2008). This calls for formative evaluation of teachers’ instructional practices and sharing of professional knowledge gathered in practice among colleagues, sensitivity to teachers’ individual personality, and democratic leadership. Akpa and Abama (1991).

According to Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan, (2007) case studies of schools with high student’s achievements in U.S.A have demonstrated a positive correlation between professionalism and high student’s achievements. UNESCO (2004) observed that countries posting high students achievements, for instance, Cuba, Finland, South Korea, and Canada have embraced tenets of professionalism like teachers’ professional development and sharing of professional knowledge at the local level. According to Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2001), Finland (the leading country in students’ academic achievement) has embraced teachers’ professional autonomy, a defining characteristic of professionalism.

Studies undertaken in Kenya in relation to the Headteachers role performance in instructional supervision of which teacher supervision is part and parcel of, have revealed that Headteachers are conversant with their supervisory roles. (Kibwarei, 2007; Kirui, 2005; Opiyo, 2004 and Thiong’o, 2000). It is also known that the frequency in which they undertook their responsibilities differed (Mobegi, Ondigi and Oburu 2010, Lydia
and Nasongo 2009). However what is not clear is which supervisory approach is dominant and factors influencing its application. Opiyo (2004) has hinted that headteachers are conversant with what he referred to as general methods as opposed to modern methods. Wanzare (2002) has judged supervisory practices in Kenya as being bureaucratic without any study to confirm them as so or otherwise. Kamindo (2008) has called for a study to this effect. Therefore there is an urgent need to determine the teacher supervisory approach prevailing in secondary schools as well as factors influencing them bearing in mind that they have a great impact on teacher quality and performance.

Literature has indicated that there is multiplicity of factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in schools to enhance education outcome. Headteachers characteristics are said to influence teacher supervisory approaches. Glanz and (2005) argues that higher learning and training influences ones belief in supervision. Pepleniski (2009) concurs with him and adds that principals holding higher degrees utilize professionalism more as compared to bureaucratic approach. She further pointed out that the converse is also true whereby principals holding qualification of masters level and below tended to apply bureaucratic approach more than professionalism. According to Roberts (2007) and Bays (2001) Headteachers with many years of experience, both teaching and supervisory, are believed to make good supervisors implying an equitable application of the two approaches. On the contrary, Delorenzo (2010) argues that Headteachers with more than five years of experience tend to be more bureaucratic in approach as compared with those with less than five years of experience who applied professionalism approach more.
In-school factors are found to influence teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers. According to Bays (2001) large number of teachers and high student enrollment is associated with emphasis on bureaucratic approach since the high span of control denies the Headteacher enough time for individualized attention upon teachers. On the other hand, a small number of teachers and students mean a narrower span of control giving Headteachers an opportunity to interact regularly with teachers in supervisory relationship hence collaboration. Availability of time for supervision to the Headteacher as well as teachers is another important factor. Since supervision is time consuming: a staff with less teaching work load will have more time to engage in supervisory activities as compared with those with less time (Sidhu and Chan, 2010 and Fischer, 2001).

Students’ academic performance in Nyeri South District has been below average for long despite having; qualified headteachers mandated to execute teacher supervisory roles, adequate competent teaching personnel, well qualified pupils from primary schools, adequate teaching/learning resources and supportive stakeholders. It is with this in mind that the researcher intends to establish factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District in Nyeri County utilizing quantitative and qualitative approaches.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As front line inspectors, Headteachers have a lot of influence in enhancing academic performance in their schools (Republic of Kenya, 1999). They are involved in translating education policies and objectives into viable programmes and in ensuring that teachers implement the set curriculum and that teaching/learning process take place effectively
within the school (Olembo et al, 1992). In spite of the Headteachers executing teacher supervisory role in their schools, and in addition to the schools having well qualified pupils from primary schools, adequate teaching/learning resources and supportive parents and stakeholders (Mukubwa, 2011), academic performance of the public secondary schools in Nyeri South District has been below average. For instance, in 2005 the District mean standard score (MSS) was 5.0479 (C-), 5.0304(C-) in 2006, 4.6764 (D+) in 2007, 4.6883(D+) in 2008 and 5.4672 (C-) in 2009 (District Education Office, Nyeri South District). These statistics indicate that the average MSS is a D+ of 4.982 which again underscores unsatisfactory performance in the district. Effective supervision has been shown to result in school improvement and effectiveness (Lezotte, 2001). The indicators of schools having effective instructional supervisors have been shown through research to include factors like teacher morale and satisfaction (MacNeil, 1992), teacher self-efficacy (Lubbers, 1996), school and organizational culture (Reid, 1987), teacher effectiveness and time on task (Watkins, 1992), and improved academic performance (Wilson, 2005). Consequently, considering the heavy investments put on education, it is important for school headteachers to ensure there is in place strong instructional leadership.

Effective teaching is central to the students’ performance in national exams (Lydia and Nasiongo 2009). Therefore how teachers are supervised by their headteachers in order to release their utmost capabilities for the students’ learning is of paramount importance. There is an urgent need therefore to establish teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in secondary schools in Nyeri South District.
1.3 The purpose of the Study

As the most immediate instructional supervisors, headteachers play a critical role in enhancing teachers’ performance in their professional duties. However, their approach to this supervisory responsibility affects their effectiveness. This study therefore sought to establish prevailing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in supervising teachers in Public Secondary Schools in Nyeri South District.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

i. To determine the prevailing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

ii. To find out Headteachers’ characteristics influencing the choice of supervisory approach in the public secondary schools in Nyeri south District.

iii. To establish in-school factors influencing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

iv. To come up with measures that can be put in place to improve teacher supervision in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

1.5 Research Questions

i. What is the prevailing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District?

ii. How do Headteachers’ characteristics influence the choice of supervisory approach in the public secondary schools in Nyeri South District?

iii. To what extent do in-school factors influence teacher supervisory approach employed by headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District?
iv. Which measures can be put in place to improve teacher supervision in public secondary schools?

1.6 Assumptions of the study

It was assumed in this research that Headteachers being frontline inspectors in their schools knew their supervisory responsibilities and executed them consistently employing both bureaucratic and professional approaches. An assumption was also to the effect that in practice one of the approaches is practiced more often than the other. Participants were deemed to be cooperative, give honest and desirable information. Because of the nature of the questions in form of a likert scale it is assumed that the participants may read for understanding and provide honest responses.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

In this study the whole population of headteachers and their teachers would have constituted the ideal number of respondents, however a small representative sample was randomly selected because of time and financial constrains experienced by the researcher. Equally, parents and Board of Governors who could have provided useful insights could not be sort because tracing them would have required considerable amounts of time, resources and other logistics not at the disposal of the researcher. The researcher also relied heavily on outside sources for literature review in view of the fact that there is lack of research in teacher supervisory approaches in Kenya.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

Teacher supervision in secondary school is undertaken by many stakeholders. Therefore, this study focused on teachers’ supervision undertaken by headteachers because they are
legally mandated to do so. The study also focused on headteachers in public secondary schools because they act as agents of teachers’ service commission which is responsible for teacher management in public schools in Kenya. The study included both headteachers and teachers as the respondents since they are the main participants in the supervisory process. Parents and members of Board of Governors were precluded from the study because tracing them would have demanded considerable amounts of time and resources which the researcher could not afford although they would have provided useful insights into the study.

1.9 Significance of the Study
The finding of this study may be of immediate benefit to the Headteacher as curriculum and instructional leaders in their schools since it may help them to evaluate their supervisory practices and make the necessary modifications so as to enhance education outcomes. The findings may provide Directorate of Quality Assurance Standards of the Ministry of Education with information on the status of teacher supervision in public secondary schools and hence stimulate necessary adjustments in supervisory programmes to improve the quality of education. Teacher training institutions like colleges, universities and even KESI, who are mandated to train teachers and management staff may find the findings useful in appraising their training programmes as they address the need and problems of practicing teachers and educational administrators. The findings may help Ministry of Education in policy formulation and implementation concerning supervision of instruction in secondary schools. The study will also enrich the existing body of literature on teacher supervisory approaches employed by headteachers as well as personal and contextual factors influencing their application.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

The purpose of supervision is to maintain and improve instruction in schools. This calls for the Headteacher to oversee his or her teachers in their work as well as to help them in improving in their instructional responsibilities. How best the Headteacher accomplishes these tasks depends on his/her perception about human behavior at work. Therefore this study is based on McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y assumptions. According to Okumbe (1998) McGregor postulated that human behavior at work can be understood to fall under two set of assumptions which he categorized as theory X and Theory Y.

**Theory X**

Theory X assumptions have a negative view of employees at work. Headteachers who have this view belief that teachers are lazy and dislike work. They can not be trusted to do what is expected of them autonomously without being coerced. Since they avoid responsibilities and seek to be led, mechanisms need to be put in place to direct and check their behaviors. Headteachers with this view emphasize on the overseeing aspect of teacher supervision by putting in place detailed rules that make teachers compliant to their instructional requirements. Deadlines for preparing schemes of work, syllabus completion, marking of exams and preparation of records of work as well as perfects’ teachers’ class attendance report epitomize this system. Professional development of teachers is either ignored or given a lip service as the head teacher does not believe in it save for in-service training to enhance compliance on the rules. Invitation for professional training courses for teachers hardly gets the Headteachers’ endorsement. School based professional training course are rarely organized as the head teacher does not appreciate their value.
**Theory Y**

According of McGregor Headteachers who prescribe to this view have a positive view of teachers. He posited that teachers are not lazy and view work as vital in life. They exercise self direction and self control if they are committed to the objectives. They are responsible and innovative and have untapped potential that can be utilized through motivation or professional development. These headteachers who advocate this view believe that teachers are capable of self direction and are keen to grow professionally. They are creative and strive for excellence because of the intrinsic desire to improve. Therefore, these headteachers create an enabling environment in their schools so that as the teachers strive for their desires, the objectives of the school are met. Some of those opportunities that Headteachers provide include clinical supervision (formative evaluation), professional development courses, peer coaching, problem solving conferences etc. This is the supporting role of the Headteacher.

**1.11 Conceptual Framework**

As curriculum and instructional leaders and immediate inspectors of their schools, Headteachers supervise their teaching personnel in the best way they deem appropriate so as to enhance quality education as reflected by satisfactory students’ academic performance. They employ either (or both) the bureaucratic supervisory approach which demands him or her to fulfill legal requirements or (and) professionalism supervisory approach which seeks to enhance professional growth of teachers increasing their effectiveness. This is thought to be influenced by headteacher’s personal attributes like; professional experience, teaching experience, age, sex and in-school factors like teachers’ work load, the number of teacher, students, etc.
**Headteachers’ characteristics**
- Academic qualifications
- Teaching experience
- Supervisory experience
- Administrative experience
- Teaching subjects
- Age
- Sex

**In-school factors**
- Number of teachers
- Number of students
- School status
- Boarding status
- School sponsor
- Number of inspection by QASO

**Bureaucratic supervisory approach**
- **Strategies**
  - Rules and regulations
  - Predetermined standards
  - Close monitoring
  - Expect and inspect

**Professionalism supervisory approach**
- **Strategies**
  - Collaboration
  - Guidance and support
  - Formative evaluation
  - Sharing of professional knowledge among teachers
  - Professional development

**Outcome**
- Excellent academic performance
- Better teacher quality

**Independent variable**

**Dependent variable**

**Source:** Researcher

**Figure 1:** Conceptual framework on factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers
1.12 Definition of Terms

Bureaucratic supervisory approach: This refers to a model of supervision in which teachers hold a subordinate position to supervisors. Accountability is the guiding light.

Evaluation: This refers to judging the quality of teachers’ performance.

Headteacher: It refers to the chief administrative officer in school charged with accountability of operational tasks of the institution. He /she may be designated as headmaster, headmistress or principal.

Headteachers characteristics: refers to individual attributes that may influence the headteachers supervisory approach. They include gender, age, academic qualifications, supervisory experience etc.

In-school factors; refers contextual attributes of the school that may have influence on the supervisory approach employed by the headteacher in the school. They may include the school enrollment size, number of teaching staff, School sponsor etc.

Professional development: This is the teacher’s or supervisor’s focus on the development of professional expertise in teaching, problem solving on matters related to students, among teachers.

Professional supervisory approach: This refers to an integrated model of supervision in which teachers and supervisors work together as professionals to mutually generate and share knowledge and skills to increase learning and produce better teaching. It involves formative supervision and professional development.

Supervisory approach: This refers to the supervisory beliefs or the guiding principles behind all supervisory actions undertaken by the supervisor. They are manifested in strategies a supervisor uses to effect teacher supervision in his/ her school.
**Supervisory experience**: This refers to having oversight responsibilities in a department or the whole school, where such responsibilities involve planning, organization and control of activities in that area.

**Supervisory Measures**: refers to plans for action, strategies or techniques put in place to effect teacher supervision in school

**Teacher supervision**: According to Zapenda (2007) a principal has three subtasks to perform in teacher supervision in the school namely: instructional supervision (formative supervision), professional development and teacher evaluation.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Literature was reviewed under the following subtopics; meaning of supervision, role of the head teacher in supervision, supervisory approaches: bureaucratic and professionalism. Variables were also reviewed under sub topics like Headteachers’ characteristics, and in-school factors influencing supervision. A conclusion was drawn at the end of the review.

2.2 Meaning of supervision

Despite the advances made in the study of instructional supervision to-date there is no consensus on any one definition of instructional supervision. Rather there is a consensus of its purpose which is to improve instruction and increase students learning (Awuah 2011). This scenario introduces an ambiguity on what needs to be emphasized on and how. A few definitions are highlighted here to amplify the relationship between supervision and improvement of teacher quality. Sergiovanni (1993) defined supervision as a set of activities and role specifications designed to influence instruction. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2009) advocates of developmental supervision conceptualizes supervision as the school function that improves instruction through direct assistance to teachers, curriculum development, professional development, group development and action research. Similarly, Zepeda (2007) whose definition has been adopted to guide this project argues that teacher supervision is an ongoing three way approach of improving instruction through instructional supervision, professional development and evaluation.
2.3 The role of Headteacher in teacher supervision

According to Zapenda (2007) a principal has three subtasks to perform in teacher supervision in the school namely: instructional supervision, professional development and teacher evaluation. These subtasks are further expounded in the discussion that follows.

2.3.1 Instructional supervision

As facilitators of the learning process, teachers encounter many challenges which they were not prepared for in the pre-service training hence they require support from their Headteachers. Walker, (2003) observed that teachers face numerous challenges in their career, which include heavy workload, inadequate time, class indiscipline and inability to motivate students among others. To overcome these challenges teachers require direct assistance which can come from peers, couches, mentors, teacher leaders, departmental heads etc but the headteacher of the school takes overall responsibility (Glickman, 2009).

Direct assistance to teachers involves activities such as class visitation, individual teacher conferences, consultative meetings, peer coaching, demonstration teaching, assistance with resources and materials, problem solving, group work among others (Zapenda 2007). However all these strategies must be geared towards improving teaching and learning as well as enhancing the growth of students and teachers. Jones et al in Thiong’o (2000, p 24) noted that:

An administrator is performing supervision when he points out research findings to teachers, confers with teachers about their work in the classroom, arranges conference or in-service courses for teachers to attend and many other routine activities at school. As long as these activities are centered about the teachers’ job in the classroom and are directed towards
enhancement of this vital process, the administrator is carrying out his responsibility of supervision.

The manner in which this direct assistance and feedback is offered by the supervisor is key to how teachers perceive it and also how it ultimately effects the achievement of its purpose as well as the goals of the school. Studies have shown that teacher see instructional supervision as a means intimidation, waste of time, witch hunting (Blumberg 1980; Zapeda 2007) Head teachers therefore must be conscious of the facts that teachers are professionals with opinions, aspirations and expertise which can be taped and gainfully utilized for the benefit of all within the school. Therefore, there is need to be sensitive teachers’ views and every effort should be made to incorporate teachers in the supervisory process. Failure to involve them not only denies them an opportunity to make meaningful contribution to learning but also to apathy towards the whole process (Zapeda and Ponticell,1998 ; Moswela, 2010).

2.3.2 Teachers’ professional development

According to Wiles and Lovell (1975) the society is dynamic, and the goals and expectations of educations continue to change in the society. It is therefore important for teachers to have an opportunity to continue to learn and develop as professionals to be abreast with these societal changes. Teachers are the societal agents through which societal changes are transmitted to the young and future generations through instruction in schools. Therefore Teachers’ thoughts and actions are central in this process for successful instruction and overall success of the school and the society as a whole (Glickman et al, 2009). Therefore, those charged with the responsibility of improving the quality of education which greatly impacts the society must focus their attention towards
improving the quality of the teaching staff. This entails of providing opportunities in which teachers gain experiences that enlarges their knowledge, skills, appreciation and understanding of their work.

This according to Walter et al (1996) this is achieved through professional development of teachers. In Kenya, the role of improving the quality of the teaching staff is undertaken by many stakeholders (Wanzare, 2000). However according to Thiong’o (2000) headteachers are first line inspectors in their schools and are constantly in touch with the unique professional needs of their individual teachers. Therefore it is their responsibility to implement staff development programmes in the schools so as to meet the professional needs of their teachers. Lodinga (1987) claims that school based professional development activities like induction, in-service workshops, educative staff meetings, study tours, internships will not succeed without the Headteachers support.

In this era of accountability the Headteacher has a great responsibility of empowering his/her teachers. First of all he/she should demonstrate a commitment to continuing professional growth of himself/herself to act as an example to be enumerated. He/she should promote a healthy professional growth climate in the school to make it easy for the teachers to pursue professional growth. Then he/she should enlist the participation of teachers in the designing and development of programmes that will provide school based professional experiences that are relevant to the needs of teachers in the school. Lastly, he/she should assess the progress in professional development of his/her teachers in the school (Wanzare 2001).
2.3.3 Teacher evaluation

As a first line instructional supervisors the head teacher is in charge of the overall performance of the school, (MOE, 1988). It is upon him or her to see to it that learners receive quality education. To do this the headteacher has to continuously evaluate specific instructional programmes, like classroom teaching, curriculum offered in the school, student’s assessment, learning resources, teachers among others. He also has to evaluate the whole instructional programme to ascertain its appropriateness in achieving the desired goals, (Glickman et al, 2009).

Teacher’s evaluation is both summative and formative. Summative evaluation involves decisions about the level of teacher performance specifically, if the teacher has met the minimum performance requirements. As an agent of the Teachers Service Commission and Ministry of Education, it is required of him or her to undertake summative evaluation of teachers. In public schools a head teacher is required to submit an annual confidential report on each teacher at least ones in a year (Birgen, 2007). The commission issues forms to be filled for this purpose to avoid personal bias by headteachers (Kamindo, 1998).

On the other hand the headteacher has the responsibilities to observe and support teachers in professional their growth and the improvement of teaching, this constitutes formative evaluation (Sergiovanni, 1995). This form of evaluation involves the use of clinical supervision which is negatively perceived by teachers (Mulunda, 2008). Therefore if the head teacher wishes to succeed in formative evaluation, he has to appeal to the trust and cooperation of the teachers (Mulunda, 2008). The headteacher must demonstrate that the evaluation is not meant for witch hunting or fault finding but is an important vehicle for receiving feedback to enhance instructional growth of teachers. This means that for the
head teacher to make a classroom observation, he/she has to inform the teacher concerned in advance, discuss with the teacher what to be observed, hold a conference to discuss the observation. It is worthy noting that the active participation of the teacher under observation must be secured in the whole supervisory process for it to have a positive impact in his/her instructional methods (Kimuya, 2007).

2.4 Supervision approaches

Many pieces of literature dealing with supervision have described various images of supervision that have been applied since 1642. Blasé and Blasé (2004) identified several processes that developed in supervision from 1850 to 1990 in United States of America, these include scientific management, democratic interaction approach, cooperative supervision, supervision as curriculum development, clinical supervision, group dynamics, peer emphasis as well as coaching and instructional supervision. Glanz and Sullivan (2005) have identified the similar process but named them differently. Despite the inconsistency in the use of terminologies, imbedded within these images are two competing approaches in supervision identified as bureaucracy and professionalism. These two are the opposite sides of supervisory continuum. Any supervisory strategy will either lean toward one end of the continuum or the other (Glanz and Sullivan 2005, Peplinisky, 2009). History of instructional supervision in United States of America (USA) has witnessed a swing back and forth from bureaucracy to professionalism and vice versa depending on the education policies and supervisory emphasis of the times (Peplinisky, 2009). Emphasis on either approach has tremendous implications on teaching and learning in schools. Kenya’s education system has had instructional supervision for almost a century, various improvements have been made, the latest being effected in 2005 yet no effort has been
made to identify the consequent supervisory approach and its implication (Republic of Kenya 2005).

2.4.1 Bureaucratic Supervisory Approach

Bureaucratic Supervisory Approach has its origins in the work of Max Weber, the father of the theory of bureaucratic management. Weber believed that man was basically unpredictable, lazy and more emotional than rational, disorganized in his approach to problems and that such dispositions increases his inefficiency (Okumbe 1998). This pessimistic assessment of human behaviour sired the need for a mechanism to instill order and efficiency among workers in an organization. Educational institutions were not spared from the demands of this bureaucratic thought right from its inception, (Sullivan and Granz 2007). According to Sullivan and Granz (2007) the need to manage schools efficiently and ensure that the prescribed curriculum was being taught brought about the application of bureaucratic inspection of schools that emphasized on strict control of teachers.

The work of Friendrick W. Taylor stressed on efficiency and the need to manage business along scientific management principles. This, according to Glanz and Sullivan (2005) brought about the search for the best methods of working and enforcing the use of those methods on part of the teachers by supervisor who are recognized as experts. According to Peplinski (2009) bureaucracy utilizes scientifically sound concepts and recognizes supervisors as experts who have a final say in curriculum matters and supervision of teachers.
Today bureaucratic supervision manifests itself in a myriad of supervisory strategies. First, the headteacher assumes that teachers cannot be trusted to do their work without being overseen hence the need to ‘Expect and inspect’ (Sergiovanni 1992). He/she therefore responds with strategies to ensure that work is done. These strategies include: exercising superiority over teachers through threats and demand for compliance on the part of teachers. Secondly, the headteacher demands compliance with rules and regulations set externally like T.S.C code of regulations as well as the Education ACT. Thirdly, the headteacher emphasizes on procedures and demands compliance e.g. drawing of schemes of work, lesson plans, and records of work, teaching methods, setting and marking of exams etc (Sergiovanni 1992). These are to be observed strictly failure to which a teacher risks disciplinary action (Okumbe 1999). Fourthly, teachers’ performance is evaluated by focusing on students’ performance in standardized exams like Mock exams results and National Examination results. When classroom observation is done, the motive is fault finding for corrective measures to be prescribed and recommendation for in-servicing. Lastly, the decision making is done by the top school management and imposed on the rest of teachers (Sergiovanni 1992). The bureaucratic supervisory approach is credited for standardization and ensuring that teachers are accountable to their work. However it is heavily blamed for autocracy, mistrust, suspicion, narrowing teachers’ performance and promoting negative attitudes by teachers towards supervision (Sergiovanni, 1992; Wanzare, 2001; Piraino, 2006; Kimuya, 2008).

2.4.2 Professionalism Supervisory Approach

Professionalism supervisory approach developed as a reaction towards the ills of bureaucratic-inspectional approach. It is based on the belief that teachers are professionals
with a desire to excel in their work. They are also capable of guiding and participating in their own professional development. This approach also deals with democratic ideals of equality and human rights. It recognizes human relations as fundamental in any working environment and that professional growth is effected through adult learning and receiving of feedback (Grickman et. al 2009; Peplinsky, 2009). The approach also regards teachers as co-workers hence collaboration between teachers and supervisors Glanz and Sullivan, (2005).

Founded on afore mentioned believes is the need to grow professionally. According to Holland, Clift and Veal (1992) pre-service training does not adequately verse the teacher trainee with all the skills, knowledge and values that would be necessary for a teacher to be effective in the classroom. Therefore the headteacher responds to this need with supervisory strategies which includes: clinical supervision in which the teacher’s genuine participation is emphasized on, attendance of in-service courses, on-the-job learning, workshops, study groups, projects and pursuit of higher degree courses like masters or doctorate degrees (Lunnenberg and Ornstein 2008).

According Sergiovanni (1992) teaching situations differ and therefore there is no one best way of teaching since teaching skill and knowledge depends with the context of the situation. This means that teachers need to continuously inquire on this contextual knowledge and share it to inform their practice. Headteachers therefore teachers are encouraged to share their professional knowledge gained in the course of teaching through peer teacher observations, teaching staff meetings, departmental meetings, subject meetings teacher symposiums etc.
For teachers to continuously improve their instructional skills they require feedback on their performance. This is achieved through formative supervision whose main purpose is to provide constructive feedback to teachers so as to improve instructional skills (Danielson and McGreal, 2000). Teachers work collaboratively with the supervisor who may be an administrator, an experienced teacher or even a peer to collect data on his/her performance through classroom observation and thereafter mutually analyze and interpret it for the benefit of the concerned teacher who is also the final decision maker (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1993).

This approach is also interested with self-regulation of teachers in the service as well as their satisfaction in their job. To achieve this many strategies have been proposed and used. Sergiovanni, (1992) has called for promotion of dialogue among teachers to make professional values and tenets of practice clear to all teachers. He has also advocated providing teachers with as much discretion as they want and need to give them a chance to try new techniques without fear of failure. Therefore teachers are obliged to hold each other accountable in observing professional values practice standards (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Professionalism is credited for meeting professional growth needs for teachers, cooperation among the teaching staff and high students’ performance in effective schools (Glanz, et al, 2007).

2.5 Headteachers’ Characteristics

Many studies indicate that the selection of headteachers considers many factors that are deemed to have significant influence in his or her duties like teacher supervision. These factors include job experience, academic and professional qualification and gender. Others
include special merit, on work performance in national examinations, special achievements in curricular activities, moral standing and initiative (Republic of Kenya 2005).

2.5.1 Principal’s Academic Qualifications

Many pieces of literature indicate that principals are selected from serving teachers who must have undergone university education (Mulken 2005). In Kenya for example principals must be degree holders and in job group M and above, they must have served as teachers continuously. The principal’s level of education has a bearing to the level of exposure to the various supervisory processes and strategies which influences his or her supervisory behavior towards his or her teachers.

According to Glannz et al (2005) supervision is influenced by beliefs which are molded by academic background and past supervisory encounters. Headteachers with only a first academic degree tend to emphasize on bureaucratic requirements in supervision. They emphasize on accountability for performance from teachers, compliance to rules and regulations, compliance to procedures and overseeing. On the other hand advanced learning creates an opportunity for learners to interact with new ideas in supervision (Peplenski 2009). This interaction enables the principals to acquire advanced understanding and deeper conceptualization of the various approaches and their impacts on the individual teachers and the organization as a whole. This is believed to have a significant impact on principal’s beliefs in supervision which forms the foundation upon which the principal draws conviction to supervise the way he/she does. Therefore, principals holding higher degree tend to emphasize on strategies that recognizes teachers as professionals with a desire to grow professionally. They therefore emphasize teacher’s professional development, through in-service courses, pursuit of higher degrees, sharing
of professional knowledge among teachers and peer supervision (Pepleniski 2009).

2.5.2 Principal’s teaching Experience

Many studies indicate that teaching experience is a requirement for head teacher’s appointment in many parts of the world. In France and Thailand one must have a professional experience of not less than five years to earn the promotion (Methi 2007 and Mulkeen 2005). In Nigeria teaching experience is the yardstick currently used to promote teachers to headship. Mulkeen, (2005) has observed that virtually all secondary school head teachers in sub Saharan Africa are experienced teachers selected on the basis of seniority. This position is not any different in Kenya as deployment to headship is on the basis teaching experience determined by the number of years in service (Sang 2008). The official position is that for one to be deployed as a Headteacher he or she must have been promoted to job group”M” a rank which takes at least six years of active service as a teacher.

From the discussion above teaching experience is considered an important factor in the success of a head teacher in his duties. The argument advanced in many pieces of literature is that experienced teachers are competent in class management, curriculum delivery, and conferencing with parents and are seasoned in interpersonal skills (Roberts and Bays 2008). Supervision being interested in improvement of instruction gives room to the view that experienced teachers have acquired in the job a repertoire of skills in instruction, collaboration, curriculum development, students management that can be used to assist novice teachers to improve their skills. Roberts (2009) also argues that the mentality that experienced teachers have “been in the trenches” gives them more credibility than inexperienced teachers and hence are able to win trust and good will
from other teachers when they point to what needs to be done. This argument presupposes that experienced teachers emphasize more on professional growth of their teachers in order to achieve the goals of the school. The contra argument is also held as true as inexperienced headteachers would emphasize more on compliance to rules and regulation to ensure that things are done.

2.5.3 Supervisory Experience

According to Glanz et al (2005) ones supervisory approach is influenced by among other factors, past supervisory encounters, either as a supervisor or as a supervisee. In a school set up a Headteacher is deemed to have acquired supervisory experience in the various deployments he she may have served in either professionally or administratively. These may include serving as a subject head, head of department, dean of studies or even as a deputy head teacher. The vast wealth of experience in a supervisory role acquired is postulated to give the holder a broad perspective and command in his or her supervisory responsibilities as posited by Akipa and Abama(2000 pg 35-36):

The dean is an experienced and very senior person in his field. As a senior and knowledgeable man in his discipline he is favorably disposed to using his wealth of experience to influence the teaching competence of the younger colleagues. The Head of department is another experienced and knowledgeable man in his and other related disciplines who has to win the confidence, support, and cooperation of teachers by demonstrating superiority in subject matter, and provision necessary leadership.

Headteachers with vast wealth of experience therefore are well acquainted with various supervisory strategies. They are also aware of when and where each approach is applicable and whether they are effective or not. Delorenzo, Jakso, Loussaint and Monte, (2010) have argued that experienced teachers are less likely to involve other people’s
opinion in the supervisory process or provide opportunities to teachers for participation in supervision. They also tend to rely on only one supervisory approach. This means that they tend to be more bureaucratic. Wanzare, (2000) advancing the case for supervisory training concluded that relying experience only leads to autocracy. On the contrary principals with less than five years of experience tend to embrace collaboration in their supervisory process a key tenet in of professionalism supervisory approach (Delorenzo, Jakso, Loussaint and Monte 2010).

2.5.5 Headteacher’s Gender

In spite of the advances made in many areas of public service appointments in the past two decades, women still have along way to go in order to participate on the same footing as men. According to Dines, (1993) males heavily outnumber females at a ratio of 20:1 at senior management levels globally. This grim statistic indicates the society’s perception of female performance in managerial responsibilities which includes supervision. This indicates an entrenched preference of men to women at the management levels. Chisikwa, (2010) in a study of social cultural factors on gender imbalance in Vihiga district observed the same trend and went further to point out that social cultural factors were to blame for this imbalance. The study specifically highlighted among other factors stereotyping of men and women as the social processes to blame. According to Fiona, (1995) women are seen as different and are often evaluated less favorably in managerial roles than men. Doubts still linger as to whether or not women are able as men to be effective in school administration. Some still cast doubts as to whether women possess the necessary toughness to oversee the smooth running of the school. Owen, (1991) further argues that women in some cultures found it difficult to exert authority over males
and that they still suffer from the myth that women are too emotional or too illogical of senior management or that they are best situated for domestic maintaining aspect of administration. On the other hand men are commonly rated more than women on traits associated with instrumentality such as leadership which is an integral component of teacher supervision.

Despite unfavorable evaluation in some quarters female headteachers have proved to be quite successful in the schools they lead. Chisikwa (2010) observed that the mixed secondary schools they headed in Vihiga district did equally well in national examinations. Grogan (2008) observed that female superintendents excel more than their male counterparts in building instructional expertise of their teachers. Inyang, (2008) noted that female principals are caring, compassionate and concerned about professional welfare of their teaching staff hence performing highly in education management.

2.6 In-school factors influence on supervision

Supervision of instruction takes place in the classroom and more widely in the school (Mpofu, 2007). Therefore, organizational attributes of the school like goals being pursued, technology and division of labour being used to achieve these goals, effectiveness of power centres responsible for managing their school as well as the environment in which the school operates inevitably have their influence on supervisory activities in the school. Bays, (2001) has identified three in school factors that influence supervision of instruction in all schools. These are the administrative structure in the school, time available to both Headteachers and teachers for supervisory activities and the size of the school.
2.6.1 The size of teaching staff

The teaching staff is the subject of teacher supervision in every school. Teachers should be the beneficiary of professional development initiatives in the school, the willing participant of the various forms of clinical supervision in the school as well as the subject of teacher evaluation in the school. The success and effectiveness of these forms of teacher supervision is evidently affected by the size of the teaching staff relative to the supervisor or the supervisory team. Where the head teacher is the sole supervisor time available for supervision becomes a major limiting factor where the size of the staff is high. According to Sidhu (2006) it becomes relatively difficult to make many classroom observations and subsequently conference with teachers since this activity is time consuming. This scenario is compounded by the fact that headteachers are juggling other administrative and managerial responsibilities in their hands (Bays 2010). This means therefore that a large size of teaching staff hinders effective teacher supervision if the supervisory team is small or limited to the Headteacher only (Moswera 2010). Makenzie (1978) in supporting this view noted that a large span of control in supervision leads to less interaction between the supervisor and teachers and tends to puts more emphasis on the use of bureaucratic strategies to supervise teaching and learning activities in the school.

2.6.2 The school sponsor

At independence the in 1963 the Government of Kenya established a commission to advise it on how to reform the education sector. The commission in recognition of the immense contributions made by religious organization in the provision education introduced the idea of school sponsor in management of church owned schools. According to Wabwoba and Enose (2010) churches were given powers to participate in the management of their former
schools as well as take part in the preparation of the syllabus for the religious education. They were also given powers to participate in the staffing of the sponsored schools as well as enjoy the use of school facilities when not in use by students.

The Education Act, Republic of Kenya, (1968 Revised in 1980) accorded the sponsor an influential position in the management of school. The Act did this by giving the sponsor the right to propose the chairman of the Board of Governors as well as appoint four other members to represent church based organizations in consultation with the Minister of Education (Wabwoba and Enose 2010). Having highest representation in the Board, Mabeya, Ndiku and Njino (2009) posit that the sponsor has greatest influence on the school management and by extension the students’ performance. They argue that the effective sponsors like the Catholic church has been supervising her schools through provision of a conducive learning environment, created through; maintaining a religious traditions and church doctrines; giving consent in appointment of headteachers; high expectations an teachers and students; ensuring that school infrastructure and assets are well kept and ensuring that religious traditions and education are taught in the school. These strategies are credited as the reasons behind the success of Catholic sponsored school in the roll of the top 100 achievers like St Francis Ngadu girls, Precious Blood Riruta girls, Kianda girls Bahati girls (Mabeya, Ndiku and Njino2009).

Church based school sponsorship has also been accused with meddling in the school affairs to the detriment of the school. Some sponsors have been accused with interference in the appointment of the school headteacher, shown favoritism among students and teachers, and even demanded favors in admission of below average students which has a negative effect in the moral of teachers.
2.6.3 The enrollment size of the school

The enrollment of the school has a significant bearing to the volume of administrative and managerial issues that the headteacher handles in the school Bays (2010). The headteacher is ultimately responsible for a wide range of administrative and managerial duties which includes among others; discipline, learning, accommodation, health, and public relations of every student. This means that principals of schools whose enrollment is high have a lot of issues to address as compared to head teachers whose schools have lower enrollments. Bays (2010), argues that this is evident in the pace that headteachers undertake their daily responsibilities in the school. Headteachers of high enrollment schools are therefore confronted with many competing administrative and managerial responsibilities which reduce the time available to the headteacher for direct interaction with teachers on instruction matters. In most cases teacher supervision suffers as the headteacher attends to more urgent and compelling duties. On the other hand headteachers of school with low enrollment have less administrative and managerial responsibilities and therefore can attend to teacher class observation, teacher conferencing, curriculum development and collaborating with teachers without straining.

2.6.4 School boarding status

Secondary schools administrations in Kenya are allowed to choose on the boarding status of their schools. Some secondary schools have opted for day school status while others with students accommodation facilities have opted for boarding status, a third option where a section of the students are day scholars while others are boarders also exists. The implication of the boarding status can be seen in the time available to teachers for engaging in planning and execution of professional development activities like attendance of in-
service courses, pursuit of higher degrees, clinical supervision etc. While teachers from boarding schools can afford to pursue these endeavors and attend to their students either early in the morning or at night or over the weekend, their counterparts in day schools do not have that opportunity. This implies that in day schools there would be more emphasis on the use of bureaucratic strategies in teacher supervision than in boarding schools which would have the utilization of the two approaches.

2.6.5 School Type or Status

Secondary schools in Kenya are broadly categorized into two groups namely; private and public secondary schools. Public secondary schools are further divided into three groups i.e. national, provincial and district secondary schools. These schools are owned by the public but managed by the government on behalf of the public through the Board of Governors and Parents-Teachers Association. This categorization reflects the geographical extent from which they admit their form one students. However the categorization also implies to a large extent the ranking of these schools in terms of students’ performance, availability of learning facilities, availability of funds, staffing and learning materials.

National and provincial schools comprise a group of ivy schools, mostly dating back to the colonial or immediate post colonial days. They are well established having the necessary learning resources be they classes, libraries, laboratories dormitories, learning materials and teachers (Kalai, 2006; Kiveu and Mayio, 2009). They are generally regarded by the public as centers of academic excellence and are the first or second choices of all Kenya Certificate of Primary Education candidates. They have well established administrative and supervisory structures with the principal as the head assisted by deputy principal, heads of departments, and subject heads. To maintain high standards these school maintains high
levels of discipline and hard work among teachers and students. This is achieved through rigorous teacher supervision and motivation, benchmarking (Griffins 1994). According to Kiveu and Mayio (2009) they charge high fees that include teacher motivation levy, which enhances teachers’ moral and commitment to work.

District schools on the other hand admit students from their respective districts. Mostly they do not have enough learning and accommodation facilities (Kalai, 2006). Majority are day schools lack well developed administrative and supervisory structures Most lack dean of studies, heads of departments, and subject heads who are vital participants in teacher supervisory process. According to Kiveu and Mayio (2009) these schools do not have enough teachers and to make matters worse they have large number of students beyond the recommended teacher-student ratio. Because these schools draw their students from their locality they are prone to local political interference in school management. These conditions have a negative effect of teacher supervision in these schools.

2.7 Summary of the Literature Review

Literature under review revealed that there is no consensus in the definition of supervision of instruction however authors agree that supervision of instruction focuses on improvement of instruction and subsequent improvement of students’ learning. Teacher supervision was understood to entail three related subtasks namely; direct assistance to teachers, professional development, and teacher evaluation. As the most immediate teacher supervisor, the headteacher shoulders the greatest responsibility of effecting teacher supervision in the school. However in exercise of this mandate the headteacher is confronted with competing supervisory approaches and has to make a choice. Bureaucratic supervisory approach offers uniformity, standardization, and focus
on organizational need but is insensitive to teachers’ intrinsic needs, narrows their performance and promotes negative attitude by teachers. On the other hand professionalism promotes teachers professional growth, collaboration, teacher empowerment but is demanding in time, finances and other resources. It is credited as a central practice in effective schools. Reviewed literature revealed that the choice of the supervisory approach by the headteacher is influenced by both individual factors as well as contextual factors. Individual or headteachers characteristics include head teacher’s academic qualifications, administrative and supervisory experiences, gender and age. On the other hand contextual factors included schools sponsor, number of teachers, and number of students in the school, school type, boarding status, and even school category.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design, locale of the study, target population, sample and sampling procedure, piloting, reliability and validity of the research instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis. It indeed explains how the study was carried out.

3.2 Research design

Orodho, (2004) defines research design as a plan that is used to generate answers to research problems. In the study, descriptive survey design was used. This is because descriptive studies are concerned with finding out “what is?” while survey methods are frequently used to collect descriptive data (Borg and Gall, 1983). Since the study was interested with what is going on at the moment in schools the research design come in handy not only to provide information needed but also to capture respondents’ perception about issues under investigation (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999).

- Study Variables

The independent variables of the study included headteachers’ characteristics, that is, academic qualifications, teaching experience, supervisory experience, administration experience, teaching subjects age and sex. The dependent variable was teacher supervisory approaches which included rules and regulations, predetermined standards, close monitoring, expect and inspect, collaboration, guidance and support, formative evaluation, sharing of professional knowledge among teachers and professional
development. These factors enhanced academic performance and teacher quality which is the outcome of the study.

3.3 Locale of the study

The study was carried out in Nyeri South District, Nyeri County. Having hailed from the region and being a teacher, the researcher was alarmed by the low standards of academic achievements in the national examinations (KCSE) from the year 2005. Despite the schools admitting qualified pupils from primary schools, having qualified teachers, run by TSC appointed Headteachers and having adequate teaching and learning resources and supportive parents and stakeholders hence its choice. Nyeri South district is economically endowed whereby residents are involved in income generating activities such as animal rearing and cash crop farming entailing coffee and tea growing.

3.4 Target population

The target population of the study was all the 33 public secondary schools in Nyeri South District, their Headteachers and teachers. This includes the nine single sex (27 %) secondary schools ( 4 boys secondary schools and 5 girls secondary schools) and the 24 (73%) mixed secondary schools in the region. Out of the total number, ten (30%) of these schools are categorized as provincial secondary schools while the rest (70%) are categorized as district secondary schools. Headteachers were purposively selected because they are the chief executive officers of their schools and are mandated to execute supervisory roles in their schools to enhance education outcomes. Teachers on the other hand participated in this study because they are the curriculum implementers and beneficiaries of supervisory initiatives.
3.5 Sample and sampling procedure

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) a sample is a small group obtained from the accessible population carefully selected as representative of the whole. Due to their disproportionalateness, schools were stratified according to their categories thus provincial and district secondary schools. This allowed every stratum to contribute to the sample a number that is proportional to its size in the population (Orodho, 2009). Simple random sampling method using the lottery technique was used to select 15 schools (45%) [5 (30%) provincial and 10 (70%) district] secondary schools. The technique was adopted because it allows equal selection of every member of the population (Orodho, 2009 and Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Headteachers were purposively selected to take part in the study because they are the chief executive officers of their schools and are mandated to execute supervisory roles in their schools to enhance education outcomes. As curriculum implementers and beneficiaries of supervisory efforts, four teachers, each from languages, humanities, sciences and applied subjects departments were selected through simple random method using the lottery technique. This is to say in every school all the teachers in one department were assigned identification numbers. On small pieces of papers, these numbers were written, folded and mixed up, then one number was picked randomly. The teacher who was assigned that number was picked to constitute the sample. This same procedure was repeated for all the other departments until all the four teachers were picked per school. This technique was used because it gives every teacher an equal chance of being selected (Orodho, 2009).
3.6 Research instruments

To collect quantitative data from the participants, the researcher used questionnaires for Headteachers and teachers. The instrument has the ability to collect a large amount of information in a reasonably quick space of time, gives respondents a measure of anonymity and questions are standardized (Orodho, 2009). The questionnaires were also preferred because they enable a researcher to quantify the responses for analytical purpose (Best and Kahn, 1993). The research instruments were designed on the basis of research objectives. The Headteachers’ questionnaire was divided into four sections. Section ‘A’ solicited personal information about the Headteacher while section ‘B’ consists of twenty one statements relating to Headteacher’s supervisory practices to which the Headteacher is supposed to respond to. Ten of them describe a bureaucratic disposition while the other eleven describe a professionalism disposition. The Headteachers’ responses are collected using a Likert scale ranging from: no opinion, not at all, slight extent, some extent, great extent. Section ‘C’ gathers information about in-school factors while section ‘D’ consists of one open ended question seeking measures to improve supervision in schools.

The teachers’ questionnaire was divided into four sections. Section ‘A’ solicited personal information about the teacher while section ‘B’ consisted of twenty one statements relating to Headteacher’s supervisory practices to which the teachers were supposed to respond to. Ten of them describe a bureaucratic disposition while the other eleven describe a professionalism disposition. The teachers’ responses were collected using a Likert scale ranging from: no opinion, not at all, slight extent, some extent, great extent.
Section ‘C’ consists of one open ended question seeking measures to improve supervision in schools.

3.7 Validity

This refers to the degree to which a test measures what it purports to be measuring (Orodho, 2005). The researcher developed table showing distribution of questions based on the research objectives to aid in item analysis. The research supervisors who are competent in the area being investigated examined the questionnaires individually and provided feedback. Their recommendations were incorporated in the final questionnaire which was pre-tested in one of the un-sampled schools.

3.8 Reliability of research instrument

Reliability is concerned with the degree to which the same results could be obtained with repeated measure of accuracy of the same concept (Orodho, 2005). If the scores obtained by each respondent are identical from two tests then the instruments will be perceived to be reliable. To test the reliability of the research instruments, the researcher carried out a pilot study in one school in the district that was not included in the actual study. This helped to identify any deficiencies, for example, unclear questions and wrong phrasing of questions. The questionnaires issued by the researcher were collected on the same day. Vague questions identified from the response of the participants rephrased so that they conveyed the same meaning to all (Orodho, 2005). The researcher employed the Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha technique of measuring reliability. The questionnaire results were analyzed using a computer package Stata which generated Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha for both headteachers and teacher questionnaires as 0.8826 and 0.8316 respectively. These Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha is considered way above the modest
reliability of 0.70 according to Munnally & Bernstein (1994) to consistently give reliable results.

3.9 Pilot Study

Prior to visiting the schools for data collection, the researcher pre-tested the questionnaires using two schools in the District, which were not included in the actual study. The purpose of the pilot study was to enable the researcher improve the reliability and validity of the instruments, and to familiarize with its administration.

3.10 Data collection procedure

Before proceeding to the field for data collection, the researcher submitted three approved copies of the research proposal to the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum studies, Kenyatta University, so as to be forwarded to the Graduate School for examination and approval to carry out the study. Upon approval, the Graduate School issued a letter introducing the researcher to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology which was then submitted to the National Council of Science and Technology (NCST) responsible for issuance of the research permit. This was accompanied by two duly approved research proposals, two passport size photographs, comprehensive curriculum vitae, completed application form and a copy of identity card. After obtaining a research permit and research authorization letter, the researcher made courtesy calls to the District commissioner and the District Education officer, Nyeri South to seek their goodwill. The researcher then booked appointments with the principals of the sampled schools and agreed on the date when he would administer the questionnaires. Thereafter, he visited each of the sampled schools
and administered the questionnaires himself. The respondents were given instructions and assured of confidentiality after which they were given enough time to fill in the questionnaires. The researcher collected the filled-in questionnaires after a week.

### 3.11 Data analysis

Descriptive and analytical statistics were used to analyze the data obtained. Data collected from the field was coded and entered into the computer for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis procedures employed involved both qualitative and quantitative procedures. This is because quantitative and qualitative data was gathered. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically, whereby similar responses were tallied to come up with frequency counts and then percentages calculated based on the total number of responses.

Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics including frequency counts, percentages and means. Bell (1993) maintains that when making the results known to a variety of readers, percentages have a considerable advantage over more complex statistics. On the other hand, Borg and Gall (1983) hold that the most widely used and understood standard proportion, is the percentage. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-test were used to find out the effects of the various independent variables on teacher supervisory approach. All statistical analyses were conducted at the 0.05 level of significance. Data was presented in summary form using frequency distribution tables, bar charts and pie charts.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter covers analysis of data and the findings of the study. The overall objective of the study was to establish factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in supervising teachers in Public Secondary Schools in Nyeri South District. The objectives of the study were to: determine the prevailing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District, establish Headteachers’ characteristics influencing the choice of supervisory approach in the public secondary schools in Nyeri south District, establish in-school factors influencing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District and establish measures that can be put in place to improve teacher supervision in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

4.2 Demographic Data

The study targeted a sample of 15 headteachers and 60 teachers from public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. Out of 15 headteachers, 8 (53.3%) were males while 7 (46.7%) were females. Among the 60 teachers, 35 (58.3%) were males while 25 (41.7%) were females.
Table 1: Age distribution of the study participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age distribution</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that majority of the headteachers (73.3%) were aged between 41 and 50 years while the rest (26.7%) were aged 51-60 years. This implies that majority of the headteachers are in their mid-life while a significant number is approaching retirement age. This implies an aging school leadership in the sub county. As for the teachers, 63.3% were aged below 40 years, while 46.3% aged above 41 years. This implies that majority of the teachers are young with long carrier life ahead of them an opportunity to influence them positively through supervision. In comparison with their headteachers there is a clear age difference between them. Headteachers are older than the teachers meaning that they have more experience than the teachers under their supervision.
Table 2: Professional qualifications of headteachers and teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional qualifications</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, 73.3% of the headteachers had Bachelor’s degree qualifications while 26.7% of them had Master’s degrees. On the other hand, 56.7% of the teachers were Bachelor’s degree holders, 33.3% had Diplomas in Education while 10.0% of them had Master’s degree qualifications. This implies that most of the headteachers and teachers had Bachelor’s qualifications. These are the basic professional requirements to teach in secondary school in Kenya. However the observation that there are Master’s degree holders teaching in secondary schools points at the felt need to improve individual professional skills. Perhaps this is an indication that the higher the professional qualification one has the more effective one is in his/her role performance. In headship it implies professional authority over the teachers hence respect when supervising them. Onyango (2001).
Table 3: Teaching experience of headteachers and teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that majority (80.0%) of the headteachers had a teaching experience of over 16 years. This implies that headteachers had taught for a long time and hence were expected to have gathered a lot of practical experience for them to be effective in their work performance. The table also shows that only 28.3% of the teachers had a teaching experience of 5 years or below, with the majority of them having taught for over 10 years. The results imply that the teachers in the study had adequate experiences with the supervisory practices of their headteachers, and were therefore in a position to give valid appraisals of such practices. In relation to the above findings, Rugai and Agih (2008) observes that, a teacher is expected to improve his/her skill level depending on the length of time employed. The longer the time employed, the more experience and better skills obtained. This as a result leads to improvement in job performance which contributes to students’ academic performance. Work experience allows the accumulation of skills and knowledge that make a teacher more productive hence influencing supervisory approach that best suit him or her.
4.3 Teacher Supervisory Approaches Employed by Headteachers

The first objective of the study was to determine the prevailing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. Table 4 shows the mean scores and standard deviations obtained by the respondents (Headteachers and teachers) on aspects based on Professionalism Supervisory Disposition.
Table 4: Respondents’ scores on professional supervisory disposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent does headteacher engage in the following professionalism supervisory practices</th>
<th>Headteachers (n=15)</th>
<th>Teachers (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote attendance of in service courses to improve teachers’ performance e.g. by funding, providing information, rescheduling of classes.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes exchange of ideas on teaching and learning practices through teaching staff meeting departments meetings, subject meeting etc.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages teachers in planning of professional development activities in the school e.g. school workshops, professional study tours etc.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses with teachers about their professional development goals e.g. pursuit of a higher degree</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate teacher’s access professional development resources and e.g. journals, books on teaching and learning, educational reports</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts inductions and orientation activities for new teachers in the school.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates with teachers in developing strategies that have impact on teaching and learning e.g. team teaching, curriculum development</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes sharing among teachers to improve teaching skills e.g. through peer observation, mentoring team teaching for effectiveness</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists teachers who are struggling in teaching to improve e.g. by class demonstration</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives feedback after classroom observation whether orally or in written form</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses with teachers before making classroom observation</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, the mean scores obtained by the respondents on the professional supervisory disposition items ranged from 4.67 to 3.47 for headteachers and 3.93 to 2.22 for teachers. Mean scores close to 5 (above 4.5) denoted that headteachers engaged in practices to a great extent while the mean scores close to 1 (below 2.5) denoted that they slightly or never engaged in the activity. Based on the findings presented above, it is clear from the results that headteachers rated themselves either to some extent or to a great extent on all the items in the scale. This means that headteachers perceived themselves to be engaged in professionalism in teacher supervision in their respective schools. This high rate of self perception indicates that headteachers perceive themselves to be competent in professionalism approach.

On the other hand teachers rated their headteachers differently. In the following statements indicating professional development and exchange of professional knowledge, teachers rated their headteachers to some and to a great extent: promoting attendance of in service courses to improve teachers’ performance e.g. by funding, providing information, rescheduling of classes with a mean of 3.93 ; promoting exchange of ideas on teaching and learning practices through teaching staff meeting departments meetings, subject meeting: mean 3.85; facilitates teachers access professional development resources e.g. journal books on teaching and learning ,educational reports: mean 3.62.

Those activities that headteachers engaged in slight extent included ; Promoting sharing among teachers to improve teaching skills e.g. through peer observation, mentoring team teaching for effectiveness: mean 3.42; engaging teachers in planning of professional development activities in the school e.g. school workshops and professional study tours : mean 3.28; discussing with teachers about their professional development goals: mean
3.05; Conducting inductions and orientation activities for new teachers in the school: mean 2.97. Lastly activities that done slightly or not done at all include; discussing with teachers before making classroom observation: mean 2.25, giving feedback after classroom observation whether orally or in written form: mean 2.25 and assisting teachers who are struggling in teaching to improve e.g. by class demonstration: mean 2.22.

From the foregoing responses it can be observed that headteachers in Nyeri south district took professional development of their teachers seriously. They did this by promoting attendance of in-service courses, provision of professional documents, journals, newspapers etc. They also rescheduled teachers’ duties. This gave the concerned teachers an ample time to concentrate on his/her studies and at the same time undertake his/her teaching responsibilities. Headteachers were also rated highly in sharing of professional knowledge through teaching staff meeting, departmental meetings and subject meetings.

According to the response by the teachers headteachers faired poorly in collaborating with the teachers in that they undertook the following practices only slightly; engaging teachers in planning professional development activities in the school, promoting peer supervision, conducting induction and orientation of new teachers and discussing professional development goals with their teachers. This means that although the Education Act gives the principal in conjunction with B.O.G, authority to organize workshops and seminars for teachers such school based workshops are rare in the district. However headteachers and staff organized study tours to schools that have better students’ academic performance. The identifying of the schools to be visited and the logistics involved would be done collaboratively by headteacher and teachers. This took
either the form of fact finding missions whereby a group of selected teachers were sent, or a situation whereby the whole staff spent a day interacting with the staff of the other school as they carried their teaching duties.

Lastly headteachers were perceived as not taking direct assistance to teachers seriously. They did not conduct classroom observation of their teachers, nor did they give any feedback to them after observation. They showed no inclination to support struggling teachers either through demonstrations or any other professional strategy. This means that clinical supervision is not a preferred means of teacher supervision in the district. It also means that teachers are missing the opportunity to receive feedback on their teaching behaviour in class from their most immediate supervisor in the school a scenario that may perpetuate mediocre teaching in classes. This state of affairs suggests that headteachers are not confident in applying clinical supervision as a strategy in teacher supervision or that teachers have a negative attitude towards it thus discouraging headteachers.

Table 5 shows mean scores and standard deviations obtained by the respondents on the items based on bureaucratic supervisory disposition.
Table 5: Respondents’ scores on bureaucratic supervisory disposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent does headteacher engage in bureaucratic practices</th>
<th>Headteachers (n=15)</th>
<th>Teachers (n=60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By observing teacher punctuality and attendance in class.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By checking adherence to legal requirements on supervision based on education Act, T.S.C code of regulations, operation effective 40</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By students’ performance in the standardized exams e.g. K.C.S.E results in his/her teaching subjects</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By compliance to procedural requirements e.g. development of schemes of work records of work and other professional documents</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures that professional development activities the school is involved in are related to the school curriculum</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By checking students notebooks, projects to evaluate teacher performance</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By using prefects/students reports about teachers behaviour in the classroom</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribes to teachers specific instructional methods with the aim of improving their teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits classes to make judgment about teacher performance in class</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through classroom observation using checklist of behaviours observed.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that headteachers obtained mean scores ranging from 4.73 to 2.53 while teachers obtained mean scores ranging from 4.7 to 1.97 on the bureaucratic supervisory...
disposition items. Both headteachers and teachers reported high rating of bureaucratic practices. The use of following bureaucratic practices was reported by teachers as being carried out to some or to a great extent; Note that mean scores close to 5 (above 4.5) denoted that headteachers engaged in practices to a great extent while the mean scores close to 1 (below 2.5) denoted that they slightly or never engaged in the activity. Table 5 indicates that the following bureaucratic practices were undertaken to some or to a great extent; observing teacher punctuality and attendance in class: mean 4.70; checking adherence to legal requirements on supervision based on education Act, T.S.C code of regulations, operation effective 40: mean 4.65; students’ performance in a standardized exam: mean 4.62. and compliance to procedural requirements e.g. development of schemes of work records of work etc: mean 4.60. These high observations made indicate that headteachers are keen on observing the legally mandated teacher supervision practices. This is in congruence with observations made by Paplenisky (2009) who noted that these bureaucratic practices are traditionally required and emphasized in legal documents hence emphasized on by administrators.

The following practices received average ratings ranging from slight extent to some extent; Ensures that professional development activities the school is involved in are related to the school curriculum: mean 4.18; By checking students notebooks, projects to evaluate teacher performance: mean 3.93; By using prefects/students reports about teachers behaviour in the classroom: mean 3.72; Prescribes to teachers specific instructional methods with the aim of improving their teaching effectiveness: mean 3.65. These ratings indicate that headteachers employed these strategies although not as frequently as the former. It also indicates that the headteachers are keen on meeting
organizational requirements of the school. The other two strategies i.e. Visits classes to make judgment about teacher performance in class: mean 2.48; and makes classroom observation using checklist of behaviors observed: mean 1.98. received low ratings. This is an indication that headteachers rarely undertook classroom observation. This could be because the checklist provided by the Manual for Supervision of Education institutions in Kenya is evaluative an aspect that is opposed by teachers.

Comparing teacher responses on Table 5 to those in Table 4, it emerges that teachers rated headteachers higher on the bureaucratic supervisory disposition items with a mean of 3.85 than on professional supervisory disposition items with a mean of 3.06.

Based on the ratings of headteachers as reported in the preceding two tables, overall ratings on headteachers’ supervisory approaches were computed by determining the mean scores for professional and bureaucratic supervisory dispositions. Figure 2 shows the overall scores obtained on the two supervisory practices.

![Figure 2: Overall ratings on supervisory practices](image)
Figure 2 shows that 73.3% of the teachers rated headteachers supervisory practices as bureaucratic, 23.3% of them rated them as both bureaucratic and professional while 3.3% rated them as professional. On the other hand, through self ratings 93.3% of the headteachers rated themselves as both bureaucratic and professional while only 6.7% rated themselves as bureaucratic. It therefore emerges that most of the teachers appraised their headteachers as employing bureaucratic supervisory approach, as opposed to headteachers who appraised themselves to be combining both professional and bureaucratic supervisory approaches. The self-ratings of headteachers are in line with findings by Peplenisky (2009) who established that bureaucratic teacher supervision is traditionary required and therefore emphasized on by supervisors.

In order to control for the contradictory appraisals by headteachers and teachers (whereby headteachers rated themselves higher than they were rated by teachers) an average rating score was computed for each headteacher. This was done by adding the headteacher’s self rating to the ratings of the four teachers in his/her school and dividing the result by five to obtain the average. Table 6 shows the results obtained.
Table 6: Overall ratings of headteachers on supervisory practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Headteachers ratings</th>
<th>Teachers ratings</th>
<th>Overall mean scores</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Bur</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Bur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>44.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>41.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>38.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>36.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>38.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>38.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>40.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>32.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>41.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 6, headteachers obtaining overall mean scores of 3.5 or above were considered to be engaging the supervisory practice in question, while those obtaining scores below 3.5 were considered not to engage in the practice. For instance, headteacher in school A obtained a score of 3.4 on professionalism and 4.0 on bureaucratic disposition, meaning the headteacher was considered to be bureaucratic. On the other hand, the headteacher in school C obtained a score of 4.2 on both professionalism and bureaucratic dispositions, meaning this headteacher practiced a combination of the two supervisory approaches. The results show that 8 (53.3%) of the headteachers engaged in both professional and
bureaucratic supervisory approaches while 7 (46.7%) of them engaged in bureaucratic supervisory approach. This implies that majority of the headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District were using bureaucratic supervisory approach while giving little attention to professional approach. This is in agreement with the argument put forth by Wanzare (2006) who states that most headteachers in Kenya rely on autocratic supervisory approach.

The above observations negate the recommendation by Sergiovanni (1995) that headteachers should use the 80/20 rule which states that supervisors should spend no more than 20% of their time on administrative supervision leaving 80% of their time on professional development and improvement of their teachers. According to Akpa and Abama, (1992) and Piraino, (2006) bureaucratic approach is based on the assumption that teachers are incompetent and lazy hence the need to inspect, closely monitor and evaluate their work using fixed standards. This, according to Mulunda (2008) is the genesis of negative view of teacher supervision by teachers. Sang (2008), blames leadership and managerial ineptitude among secondary school Headteachers on this emphasis.

4.4 Headteachers’ Characteristics Influencing Choice of Supervisory Approaches

The second objective of the study sought to establish Headteachers’ characteristics influencing the choice of supervisory approach in the public secondary schools. To address this objective, chi-square test was used to determine whether supervisory approaches employed differed across headteachers’ gender, age, professional qualifications, teaching experience, administrative experience and supervisory experience. The results of analysis are shown in Table 7.
Table 7: Supervisory approaches across headteachers characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteacher characteristics</th>
<th>Supervisory Approaches</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burea</td>
<td>Burea/ prof</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 illustrates that more male than female headteachers practiced bureaucratic supervisory approach, while more women tended to use a combination of professional and bureaucratic approaches. These findings are in agreement with Grogan (2008) views that women superintendents value the importance of building instructional expertise of their teachers more than their male counterparts. They are also consistent with the observations made by Inyang (2008) that female principals are caring, compassionate and concerned about the professional welfare of their staff hence performing highly in Education Management. The findings also show that most of younger headteachers (41-
50 years) were suing bureaucratic supervisory approaches in comparison to those aged 51-60 years. In relation to professional qualifications, most (6) of those with Bachelors qualifications used a combination of professional and bureaucratic supervision. The results further show that headteachers with over 20 years teaching experience were more likely to use a combination of professional and bureaucratic approaches.

Moreover, 4 headteachers with over 20 years teaching experience used a combination of professional and bureaucratic approaches. This observation implies the proportionate use of the two approaches productively. This is in agreement with Rugai and Agih (2008) who found a high relationship between teaching experience and job performance. It is also in consensus with Gede and Lawanson (2011) who concluded that the more experience an employee gathers as a result of long years of service the higher the performance of his/her job. This observation is given credence by the position held by Glickman et al (2009) that instructional supervision is tantamount to adult learning. However, these findings contradict observations made by Toh, Diong and Boo (1996) that the length of teaching experience does not influence professionalism in teaching.

Seven headteachers with over 5 years of administrative experience used a combination of professional and bureaucratic supervisory approaches. On the contrary, those with experience of below 5 years used bureaucratic supervisory approach more. This implies that administrative experience brings about the realization that effective supervision is best achieved through a combination of the two approaches. This contradicts findings by Delorenzo et al (2010) that headteachers with more than five years of administrative experience are less likely to involve other peoples’ opinion in the supervisory process or
provide opportunities to teachers for participation in the supervision which are key tenets of professionalism.

Headteachers with over 5 years of supervisory experience were bureaucratic while those with less than 5 years of supervisory experience used a combination of professional and bureaucratic approaches. However, chi-square test results indicate that headteachers’ characteristics that is; gender, age, professional qualifications and teaching experience did not influence the supervisory approaches employed at $p<0.05$.

### 4.5 In-school Factors Influencing Choice of Supervisory Approaches

The third objective of the study was to establish in-school factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by headteachers. To address this objective, Chi-square test was conducted to establish whether the supervisory approaches employed by headteachers differed across school factors. Table 8 shows results obtained.

Table 8 shows that headteachers in girls’ only schools engaged in combined professional and bureaucratic supervisory approach more than those in boys’ only and mixed schools. Headteachers in boarding schools tended to use combined professional and bureaucratic supervisory approaches while those in day schools tended to use bureaucratic approaches. District and provincial schools did not have major differences on the approaches used by headteachers. Headteachers in Government sponsored schools tended to use bureaucratic approach more in comparison to those from church-sponsored schools, who used combined approaches. Schools with less than 240 students had headteachers who used bureaucratic approaches as opposed to those with larger number of students who tended to use the combined supervisory approach more. The school boarding status, school category, and number of students in the school were variables meant to assess the level of
headteacher’s involvement in other administrative duties. The finding contradicts views by Bays (2001) who assert that the more one is involved in other administrative duties the more the emphasis on bureaucratic approach to supervision.

Supervisory approaches used were almost equally distributed across number of teachers, meaning number of teachers in the school did not influence choice of supervisory approach. This contradicts Mackenzie’s (1978), position that a large span of control means a greater emphasis of bureaucratic approach. This finding also contradicts the proposal by Okibia (1982) in Ibukuni et.al (2011) that a supervisor would ideally supervise 24 teachers. This means that with proper supervisory structures in the school, i.e. heads of departments, subject heads and the deputy principal, the principal can effectively supervise any number of teachers through delegation.

Those schools which had been inspected by QASOs twice for the last three years had headteachers who used bureaucratic approaches, as compared to those who had never been inspected and those inspected once, majority of which used the combined approach. According to Itolondo (2008) the school based supervision is supposed to work hand-in-hand with external supervisors. Therefore, the frequency of visits by external supervisors is bound to have influence on the supervisory approach emphasized on by the headteacher. The fact that schools visited twice portrayed emphasis on bureaucratic approach means the QASOs visits are bureaucratic hence the need to conform by headteacher to their expectations.
Table 8: Supervisory approaches across school characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In school factors</th>
<th>Supervisory approaches</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burea</td>
<td>Burea / prof</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding/ day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.467</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.942</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241-480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481-640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p<0.05

Chi-square test results indicated that choice of teacher supervisory approaches statistically differed across school sponsorship, at p<0.05, whereby 4 headteachers from Government sponsored schools tended to use bureaucratic approach, those from church-sponsored e.g. protestant used bureaucratic (3 schools) and both bureaucratic and
professionalism (5 schools) while those sponsored by Catholics tended to use both bureaucratic and professionalism (3 schools). The school sponsorship is the only variable that was statistically significant at $p<0.05$. The government sponsored schools indicated that headteachers use bureaucratic approach this can be explained by the fact that headteachers in these schools are only answerable to the directorate of quality assurance and standards officers who may visit the school once in three years. This means that professionalism practices that require extra effort are ignored in favor of bureaucratic practices that are traditionally required. This in line with Pepleniski’s (2009) observation bureaucratic supervision is normally undertaken because it is expressly mandated in documents guiding supervision in schools.

Schools sponsored by the Catholic Church indicated the use of both bureaucratic and professionalism approaches. This shows that headteachers in these schools are receiving supervisory attention and support not only from the Quality and Standards officers but also from the church. This is in congruence with the observation made by Wabwoba and Enose (2010) that the Catholic Church takes an active role in the management of her schools. The protestant sponsored schools showed a mixture of bureaucratic supervisory approach and bureaucratic and professionalism supervisory approaches. This can be explained by the fact that protestant sponsorship falls across diverse denomination. Some are active in management and supervision of their school while others are not. This concurs with Mabeya, Ndiku and Njino (2009) that the church is active in education management of their schools however it is also congruent with Wabwoba and Enose (2010) who observed that the Quaker Church contribution to management of her schools is minimal. However this position contradicts the Governments’ position that sponsors
only interfere with the smooth running of the school Ministry of Education (2005). The other school characteristics that is; school category, boarding status, school type, number of students, number of teachers and number of times being inspected by QASO did not significantly influence the supervisory approaches employed at \( p<0.05 \). The finding that teacher supervisory approaches statistically differed across school sponsorship could be explained by the fact that in church-sponsored schools, the church normally has an influence on the person appointed as the headteacher, and that might eventually influence some school administrative decisions and supervision styles.

4.6 Measures Needed to Improve Teacher Supervision

The fourth objective of the study was to establish measures that can be put in place to improve teacher supervision in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. To address this research objective, headteachers and teachers were asked to give their suggestions about ways that can be used to improve teacher supervision in their schools. Their responses were organized into themes whereby similar responses were tallied to come up with frequency counts and then percentages calculated based on the total number of responses. Table 9 shows their recommendations.
Table 9: Respondents’ recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteachers’ recommendations</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set achievable goals and targets and have an evaluation on the same at the end of the year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School management bodies should hold discussion with the teachers on curriculum delivery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teachers in classes and also gathering information from students about teachers performances in classrooms</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving students in monitoring attendance and punctuality of teachers in class lessons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage HODs in teachers supervision</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent offering of in-service courses among headteachers and teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESI to train school administrators on supervision and curriculum improvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of good interpersonal relationships in schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize frequent visits by QASOS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ recommendations</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school should set performance targets for all teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of teachers effectiveness through checking students’ performance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with teacher about performance after classroom observation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teacher self drive and commitment</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain professional work and good relationship between teachers and administration</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving teachers in decision making on matters concerning supervision</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government through Ministry of Education should encourage professional development by providing funding which would help teachers in attending in-service courses.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision should target all teachers equally and not biased on some</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular attendance of in-service training, seminars and workshop to keep teachers conversant with changing curriculum</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being strict on classroom attendance</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closely monitoring teachers activities i.e. schemes of work, records of work and students notebooks</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers should hold regular meeting with teachers to enhance trust and create conducive environment for mutual learning</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving Heads of Departments in teachers supervision</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular visit by QASOs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give out attendance list to class prefect on duration and content</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 above shows that headteachers gave the following measures that needed to be put in place to improve teacher’s supervision in schools: Headteachers were of the views that schools should set achievable goals and targets and have an evaluation on the same at the end of the year. Results further revealed that, 93.3% and 86.7% of the headteachers suggested that school management bodies should hold discussion with the teachers on curriculum delivery and also gather information from students about teachers’ performances in classrooms respectively. In addition, 46.7% of the headteachers were of the views that QASOs should organize for frequent visits in schools while 53.3% recommended that schools should create good interpersonal relationships.

All teachers suggested that the school should set performance targets. Teachers recommended that every school should set a performance target to be achieved every year. This is usually a mean score or average grade around which all academic efforts are geared to. This is done by averaging targets set by subject teachers in every subject and every class. This means that teachers are concerned with accountability whereby every teacher should be held accountable for the students’ performance in his or her subject. In this strategy, it is hoped that as the teachers pursued their performance targets commitment to work, team work and a culture of hard work would be cultivated among them. This is a bureaucratic strategy in evaluation. Teachers are therefore highlighting the need for setting up a measurable standard of measuring their effectiveness in their work as well as the need to participate in the formulation of that standard.

Secondly, all teachers recommended that headteachers should assess teachers’ effectiveness through checking students’ performance. Although students’ performance is influenced by many factors, teachers are suggesting that; it is a more objective measure
of a teachers’ effectiveness in teaching. From experience teachers may have noticed a close relationship between a teachers input and the students performance. This strategy removes ambiguity in teacher evaluation and places the responsibility of students’ success on teachers’ shoulders. The net effect of this is instilling teachers’ commitment by working hard. However, it has to be borne in mind that it can be quite unfair because it measure teachers’ performance indirectly. Factors like students’ willingness to excel in academics, individual differences and school facilities can greatly influence students’ performance despite a teacher’s commitment of her/his work. This can be a possible source of teachers’ frustration and friction with school administration.

Thirdly, 96.7% of the teachers recommended headteachers and teachers holding discussions on performance after classroom observation. In this recommendation teachers’ are acknowledging the need to receive valuable feedback from their headteachers after classroom observation. It also suggests that since the teacher may be observed by his supervisor at any time he/she has to always be thoroughly prepared in terms of lesson planning, lesson notes and the necessary teaching aids. This would weed out teachers who use yellow notes or never use teaching aids. It also calls upon the headteachers to learn and apply the various techniques of classroom observation like clinical supervision and classroom-walk-through.

In the fourth recommendation 93.3% of the teachers suggested that headteachers should encourage teachers self drive and commitment. In this recommendation teachers are saying that their heads can enhance their productivity by motivating them. Teaching can be frustrating; this can be due to indiscipline and lack of commitment among students. It can also be due to heavy teaching workload, poor working relationships among teachers
and administration as well as limited opportunities for professional growth. However, this can be mitigated through motivation. This could be through financial rewards for improvement in mean score, best performed subjects etc. It could also be non-financial rewards like holiday trips to tourist destinations for excellence in all fields in the school.

Majority, that is, 90.0% of the teachers called for maintaining professional work and good relationship between teachers and administration. The need to uphold and maintain professional ethics is also highlighted. This means that school working environment must be free from threats, intimidation and that the teachers’ personal worth should be appreciated and valued by the school administration. This can be achieved through regular interaction between headteachers and teachers during tea breaks, lunch breaks, games time etc. However, congenial relationships should not be allowed to push professional work ethics out. Teachers who fail in their professional duties should be called to account and if need be disciplinary action applied.

The following recommendation by teachers received minimal support as can be seen from Table 9. Forty percent of the teachers recommended that class prefects should be given lesson attendance list to indicate duration and content of the lesson. This shows that teachers are acknowledging the fact that students have a role to play in teacher supervision. It is recognition of the fact that the students are the “customers” of the teachers’ service and have the right to receive quality teaching. However, the fact that majority shied away from this strategy is an indication many teachers doubt the ability of students to give objective views and that the strategy is prone to abuse by students. Any fall out between the concerned teacher and the students would mean a negative report being delivered to the school administration.
The recommendations made by both headteachers and teachers lean heavily towards bureaucratic supervision. They are calling for teachers to be held accountable for students’ performance, cultivation of a more cordial relationship between the school administration and the teachers, incorporation of students in the supervisory process, the use of extrinsic rewards in teacher motivation, setting up of academic targets and regular evaluation thereof and lastly the strengthening internal supervision by Heads of Departments. Although the insistence of these strategies is not wrong the need for teacher growth and professional development is ignored. It also indicates that the teaching staff is more acquainted with the traditional bureaucratic supervision than professionalism this is in line with Paplenisk (2009) who argues that bureaucratic supervision is applied more because expressly mandate in the legal documents.

The call for more frequent class observations and visits by QASOs is a testimony to the fact that clinical supervision is not frequently applied in teacher supervision in the district. Close interaction between the supervisors and the supervised accorded by clinical supervision is lacking which means that collaboration between the two parties is absent. This means that teachers do not receive feedback about their teaching behavior and therefore do not grow professionally. This supports the call for attendance of in-service course.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations and areas for further research. The chapter is organized based on the following restated research objectives:

i. To determine the prevailing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

ii. To find out Headteachers’ characteristics influencing the choice of supervisory approach in the public secondary schools in Nyeri south District.

iii. To establish in-school factors influencing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

iv. To come up with measures that can be put in place to improve teacher supervision in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District.

5.2 Summary of the study

The purpose of the study was to establish factors influencing the choice of teacher supervisory approaches employed by headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District in order to mitigate against the declining students’ performance in national exams. The study was based on McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y assumptions. The study employed descriptive survey design targeting 33 public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. Simple random sampling was used to select 60 teachers while purposive sampling was used to select 10 headteachers to participate in actual study. Questionnaires were used as the main tools for data collection. Piloting was carried out to pre-test the
data collection procedure while the assistance of research experts, and experienced supervisors was secured to help improve validity of the instruments. Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha technique was used for measuring reliability while descriptive and analytical statistics were used to analyze the data obtained. Given below is the summary of the study findings.

**Determine the prevailing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteacher**

The study established that headteachers rated themselves higher than they were rated by the teachers on all the items based on professional supervisory disposition. This means that headteachers appraised themselves to engage in the professionalism supervisory approach strategies most of the time. This was opposed by teachers who reported that headteachers rarely engaged in these strategies. The study also revealed that teachers rated their headteachers higher on the bureaucratic supervisory disposition items than on professionalism supervisory disposition items.

Through overall ratings majority (73.3%) of the teachers rated headteachers supervisory practices as bureaucratic whereas headteachers (93.3%) rated themselves as both bureaucratic and professional. The results therefore implies that most of the teachers perceived their headteachers as employing bureaucratic supervisory approach, as opposed to headteachers who perceived themselves to be combining both professional and bureaucratic supervisory approaches. A combined analysis of both teachers and headteachers indicated that all headteacher (100%) employed bureaucratic supervision practices as opposed (46%) who applied professionalism practices. This implies that bureaucratic supervisory approach is the most prevalent in Nyeri South District.
Headteachers’ characteristics influencing the choice of supervisory approach in the public secondary schools

In relation to this objective, the study found out that majority of the male headteachers practiced bureaucratic supervisory approach while female headteachers tended to use a combination of professionalism and bureaucratic approaches. Regarding professional qualifications, it emerged that the choice of teachers’ supervisory approaches among headteachers did not differ across their professional qualifications at $p<0.05$. Specifically, the study established that 54.5% of headteachers with Bachelor’s qualifications and 50.0% of headteachers with Master’s qualifications used a combination of professional and bureaucratic supervision.

As far as administrative experience is concerned, the study found that headteachers with more than 5 years of experience tended to use a combination of professional and bureaucratic supervisory approaches. On the contrary those with experience of below 5 years used bureaucratic supervisory approach more. This implies that administrative experience brings about the realization that effective supervision is best achieved through a combination of the two approaches. In spite of the forgoing observations, chi-square test results indicate that headteachers’ characteristics that is; gender, age, professional qualifications and teaching experience did not have significant influence on supervisory approaches employed by headteachers.

In-school factors influencing teacher supervisory approach employed by Headteachers

Chi-square test results indicated that choice of teacher supervisory approaches was statistically significant ($p= 0.024$) across the school sponsorship. Headteachers from
Government sponsored schools 4, (100%) tended to use bureaucratic approach more while those from Protestant church-sponsored schools used different approaches 3 (37.5%) used bureaucratic approach while 5 (62.7) used a combined approach of bureaucracy and professionalism. Headteachers in Catholic sponsored schools 3(100%) This attests the fact that the involvement of the church sponsor in school management has significant influence in teacher supervision in the school. The other school characteristics that is; school category, boarding status, school type, number of students, number of teachers and number of times being inspected by QASO did not significantly influence the supervisory approaches employed.

**Measures Needed to Improve Teacher Supervision**

To improve teaching and learning in the schools, the study established that the following measures should be put in place: the schools should set achievable goals and targets and have an evaluation on the same at the end of the year; school management bodies should hold discussion with the teachers on curriculum delivery. In addition to the above measures, the study revealed that schools heads should engage in the following practices; assess teachers’ effectiveness through checking students’ performance, discuss with teachers about performance after classroom observation, encourage teachers’ self drive commitment in addition to maintaining professional work and good relationship between teachers and administration.

**5.3 Conclusion**

Based on the findings as summarized above, it was concluded that:-

i. Headteachers engaged in bureaucratic and both professional and bureaucratic supervisory practices. The results revealed that headteachers appraised themselves
to engage in the professionalism supervisory disposition aspects most of the time. However, teachers’ rated their headteachers as engaging more on the bureaucratic supervisory practices than on professionalism supervisory practices. A combined analysis of both teachers and headteachers demonstrated that bureaucratic supervisory approach was the prevailing supervisory approach in Nyeri South District.

ii. Based on the Chi-square tests, the results obtained revealed that headteachers’ characteristics i.e. gender, age, professional qualifications and teaching experience, administrative and supervisory experiences did not have influence on the supervisory approaches employed by headteachers.

iii. In-school characteristics like school category, boarding status, school type, number of students, number of teachers and number of times being inspected by QASO did not have influence on the supervisory approaches employed by headteachers. However the results also revealed that choice of teacher supervisory approaches differed across school sponsorship, whereby headteachers from Government sponsored schools tended to use bureaucratic approach more while those from church-sponsored schools used both bureaucratic and professional approaches.

iv. Concerning measures needed to improve supervision in secondary schools, five broad strategies emerged: setting of achievable targets and evaluating teacher performance on the same at the end of the year, regular mutual discussions between the school management and the teachers on curriculum delivery,
evaluating teachers’ effectiveness through students’ performance, giving feedback after classroom observation, and motivating teachers to enhance performance.

5.4 Recommendations

On the strengths of the study findings and conclusions the following recommendations were made:

i. In view of the fact that bureaucratic supervisory approach is prevailing in the district, the government through Ministry of Education should promote the use of professionalism supervisory approach in teacher supervision in Kenya.

ii. In view of the fact that no personal characteristic has significant influence on supervisory approach employed, headteachers should engage teachers in supervising one another.

iii. Bearing in mind that school sponsor has a significant influence on supervisory approach, it is therefore important to strengthen the role of sponsors in secondary school management.

iv. School management bodies should be encouraged to take an active role in teachers’ supervision to enhance their productivity and increase students’ academic performance.

5.5 Areas for Further Research

i. A study should be undertaken to identify factors influencing the choice of teacher supervisory approaches employed by headteachers in a larger geographical area like a county.
ii. A study should be undertaken to determine why professionalism supervisory practices are not readily employed by Headteachers in secondary schools on Kenya.

iii. A study should be conducted to determine how school sponsor influences teacher supervision in Kenya.

iv. A further study should be conducted to determine whether individual characteristics have influence on supervisory approach employed by headteachers in secondary schools.
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APPENDIX 1

HEADTEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire seeks to collect crucial information in relation to factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. The information obtained will be treated with a lot of confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this study only. You are therefore kindly requested to respond to all the questions.

SECTION A: Information about you.

1. Sex
   Male  □  Female  □

2. Age
   Below 30 years  □  31-40 years  □
   41-50 years  □  51-60 years  □

3. Professional qualification; tick the most current qualification you hold.
   PhD  □  Master  □
   Bachelors  □  Diploma in ED  □
   Others (specify)  ----------------------------------------

4. Years of teaching experience.
   0-5 years  □  6-10 years  □
   11-15 years  □  16-20 years  □
   21+ years  □

5. Years of administrative experiences as Headteacher _________________________ years.

6. Years of supervisory experience as a head of department or Dean of academics
   _________________________ years.
7. Have you attended any course or seminar on teacher staff management organized by KESI?

Yes ☐ No ☐

8. State your teaching subjects

(i) ________________________________

(ii) ________________________________

SECTION B

The following statements relate to your supervisory practices as a head teacher. Please choose for each item the words that you think fits your opinion about your practice.

| Q9 | Facilitate teacher’s access professional development resources and e.g. journals, books on teaching and learning, educational reports |
| Q10 | Promote attendance of in-service courses to improve teachers performance, e.g. by funding, providing information, rescheduling of classes, etc |
| Q11 | Promotes exchange of ideas on teaching and learning practices through teaching staff meeting departments meetings, subject meeting etc. |
| Q12 | Conducts inductions and orientation activities for new teachers in the school. |
| Q13 | Engages teachers in planning of professional development activities in the school e.g. school workshops, professional study tours etc. |
| Q14 | Discusses with teachers about their professional development goals e.g. pursuit of a higher degree. |
| Q15 | Ensures that professional development activities the school is involved in are related to the school curriculum. |
### INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(IS)</th>
<th>To what extent do you as a head teacher …………………</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slight extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Discusses with teachers before making classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Visits classes to make judgment about teacher performance in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Assists teachers who are struggling in teaching to improve e.g. by class demonstration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Promotes sharing among teachers to improve teaching skills e.g. through peer observation, mentoring team teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Prescribes to teachers specific instructional methods with the aim of improving their teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Collaborates with teachers in developing strategies that have impact on teaching and learning e.g. team teaching, curriculum development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Gives feedback after classroom observation whether orally or in written form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEACHER EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(TE)</th>
<th>To what extent do you evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher …………………</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slight extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>By students’ performance in the standardised examples e.g. K.C.S.E results in his/her teaching subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>By compliance to procedural requirements e.g. development of schemes of work records of work and other professional documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>By observing teacher punctuality and attendant in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>By checking students notebooks, projects to evaluate teacher performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Through classroom observation using checklist behaviours observed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By using prefects/students reports about teachers behaviour in the classroom.

By checking adherence to legal requirements on supervision based on education Act, T.S.C code of regulations, operation effective 40.

SECTION ‘C’ SCHOOL RELATED FACTORS

30 Please tick the statement that best suites your school,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School gender</th>
<th>Boy only</th>
<th>Girls only</th>
<th>Both boys &amp; girls (mixed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boarding status</td>
<td>Boarding</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Both boarding and day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give the following information as accurately as possible.

31 Number students in your school

Boys ____________

Girls ____________

Total ____________

32 Number of teachers in your schools

Male ____________

Female ____________

Total ____________

33 What is the curriculum based establishment of your school ________________

34 Distance in kilometers from the district education office to your school__________km.
35. How many times has your school been inspected by quality assurance and standards officers in the last three years__________

SECTION ‘E’

36. Suggest ways that can be used to improve teacher supervision in your school.

.......................................................... ..........................................................

.......................................................... ..........................................................

.......................................................... ..........................................................

.......................................................... ..........................................................

.......................................................... ..........................................................
APPENDIX II

TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire seeks to collect crucial information in relation to factors influencing teacher supervisory approaches employed by Headteachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri South District. The information obtained will be treated with a lot of confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this study only. You are therefore kindly requested to respond to all the questions.

SECTION A: Information about you.

1. Sex
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. Age …………………….years
   - Below 30 years [ ]
   - 31-40 years [ ]
   - 41-50 years [ ]
   - 51-60 years [ ]

3. Professional qualification; tick the most current qualification you hold.
   - PhD [ ]
   - Master [ ]
   - Bachelors [ ]
   - Diploma in ED [ ]
   - Others (specify)  ____________________________

4. Years of teaching experience.
   - 0-5 years [ ]
   - 6-10 years [ ]
   - 11-15 years [ ]
   - 16-20 years [ ]
   - 21+ years [ ]

5. State your teaching subjects
   (i) ____________________________
   (ii) ____________________________
**SECTION B**

The following statements relate to your supervisory practices as a head teacher. Please choose for each item the words that you think fits your opinion about your practice.

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(PD)</th>
<th>To what extent does your Headteacher</th>
<th>PREFERRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Facilitate teacher’s access professional development resources and e.g. journals, books on teaching and learning, educational reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Promote attendance of in-service courses to improve teachers performance, e.g. by funding, providing information, rescheduling of classes, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Promote exchange of ideas on teaching and learning practices through teaching staff meeting departments meetings, subject meeting etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Conduct inductions and orientation activities for new teachers in the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Engage teachers in planning of professional development activities in the school e.g. school workshops, professional study tours etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Discuss with teachers about their professional development goals e.g. pursuit of a higher degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Ensure that professional development activities the school is involved in are related to the school curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(IS)</th>
<th>To what extent does your head teacher</th>
<th>PREFERRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Discuss with teachers before making classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Visit classes to make judgment about teacher performance in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Assist teachers who are struggling in teaching to improve e.g. by class demonstration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16 Promote sharing among teachers to improve teaching skills e.g. through peer observation, mentoring team teaching effectiveness.

Q17 Prescribe to teachers specific instructional methods with the aim of improving their teaching effectiveness.

Q18 Collaborate with teachers in developing strategies that have impact on teaching and learning e.g. team teaching, curriculum development.

Q19 Give feedback after classroom observation whether orally or in written form.

TEACHER EVALUATION

(TE) To what extent does your Headteacher evaluate your effectiveness by:

| Q20 | By students’ performance in the standardised exams eg KC.S.E results in his/her teaching subjects |
| Q21 | By compliance to procedural requirements e.g. development of schemes of work records of work and other professional documents. |
| Q22 | By observing teacher punctuality and attendance in class. |
| Q23 | By checking students notebooks, projects to evaluate teacher performance |
| Q24 | Through classroom observation using checklist behaviors observed. |
| Q25 | By using prefects/students reports about teachers behavior in the classroom. |
| Q26 | By checking adherence to legal requirements on supervision based on education Act, T.S.C code of regulations, operation effective 40. |

SECTION ‘C’

Q27. Suggest ways that can be used to improve teacher supervision in your school.
APPENDIX III

RESEARCH PERMIT